	Case 3:08-cv-05197-FDB Document 9 Filed 06/05/08 Page 1 of 3		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
11	AT TACOMA		
12			
13	JASON ELLENWOOD,		
14	Plaintiff,		
15	V.	Case No. C08-5197FDB	
16	DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS MENTAL/MEDICAL HEALTH <i>et al.</i> ,	ORDER TO AMEND	
17	Defendants,	THE COMPLAINT	
18			
19	This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Civil Rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge		
20	pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Magistrates' Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, and		
21	MJR 4. Plaintiff has been granted leave to proceed <i>in forma pauperis</i> . The court now considers the 50 page		
22	proposed complaint (Dkt. # 1). Plaintiff names no person in his complaint, only sub agencies within the		
23	Department of Corrections.		
24	In order to state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a complaint must allege that (l) the conduct		
25	complained of was committed by a person acting under color of state law and that (2) the conduct		
26	deprived a person of a right, privilege, or immunity secured by the Constitution or laws of the United		
27	States. Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981), overruled on other grounds, Daniels v. Williams, 474		
28	U.S. 327 (1986). Section 1983 is the appropriate avenue to remedy an alleged wrong only if both of these		
	ORDER Page - 1		

elements are present. <u>Haygood v. Younger</u>, 769 F.2d 1350, 1354 (9th Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 478 U.S. 1020 (1986).

Neither states nor state officials acting in their official capacities are persons for purposes of 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 48, 71 (1989). This rule applies equally to state agencies. See Kaimowitz v. Board of Trustees of the Univ. of Ill., 951 F.2d 765, 767 (7th Cir. 1991); Johnson v. Rodriguez, 943 F.2d 104, 108 (1st Cir. 1991). Because they are not persons within the meaning of § 1983, plaintiff has not stated a cause of action against these state agencies.

Plaintiff's claims against the state agencies are also barred by the Eleventh Amendment. The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution bars a person from suing a state in federal court without the state's consent. See Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida 116 S.Ct. 1114, 1131 (1996); Natural Resources Defense Council v. California Dep't of Transportation, 96 F.3d 420, 421 (9th Cir. 1996). Eleventh Amendment immunity extends to state agencies. Pennhurst State Sch. & Hosp. v. Holdeman, 465 U.S. 89, 101-102(1984). Eleventh Amendment immunity is not automatically waived in actions brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Quern v. Jordan, 440 U.S. 332 (1979). Washington has not waived the protection of the Eleventh Amendment. Edgar v. State, 92 Wn.2d 217 (1979). Plaintiff does not name any of the medical or mental health personnel as defendants. Instead, he names sub departments within the Department of Corrections.

Further, the complaint is a 50 page narrative. Fed. R. Civ. P 8 (a) requires a short plain statement of the claim showing plaintiff is entitled to relief. Plaintiff's recitation of the history leading to his facial injury and his recitations alleged emotional conditions are not relevant to the claims except to the extent plaintiff claims emotional injury as a result of defendants alleged failure to act.

The clerk is directed to send plaintiff a form prisoner 1983 complaint. Plaintiff is directed to fill out the form. Plaintiff may attach additional sheets as needed, however, plaintiff is warned, the complaint must contain short clear statements of his claims. An amended complaint will be due on or before **July 11**, **2008**, Plaintiff is informed that failure to file an amended complaint or failure to cure the defects in his complaint will result in a Report and Recommendation that this action be dismissed.

Plaintiff has also filed a letter asking the court for guidance in conducting discovery and obtaining information regarding the names of the persons he wishes to sue (Dkt. # 6). First, the court does not

Case 3:08-cv-05197-FDB Document 9 Filed 06/05/08 Page 3 of 3

conduct business by letter. Where plaintiff needs court action the proper filing is a motion which must be served on opposing parties or their counsel. Second, the court cannot give legal advice to a party.

Plaintiff's letter will remain in the file without any further court action on that document.

The clerk's office is directed to send plaintiff another copy of the form and note the **July 11, 2008,** date on the court's calendar.

DATED this 5 day of June, 2008.

/S/ J. Kelley Arnold
J. Kelley Arnold
United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER Page - 3